

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: DATE FILED: 5/16/2023
--

-----X  
SUN YEUL HONG,

Plaintiff,

-v-

MOMMY'S JAMAICAN MARKET CORP., KAP WON  
KIM, MYONG SU KIM, DAE KYU KIM,Defendants.  
-----X

20-cv-9612 (LJL)

ORDER

LEWIS J. LIMAN, United States District Judge:

In a letter dated May 15, 2023, Plaintiff requests to “correct typographical errors in [his previous motion to compel discovery, Dkt. No. 122]. The year 2019 should read 2020, and the year 2020 should read 2021.” Dkt. No. 128 at 1. The Court’s May 15, 2023 Order, Dkt. No. 129, is modified to the degree necessary to reflect these typographical changes. Plaintiff also requests that the Court compel the appearance of Defendants Kap Won Kim and Myong Su Kim. Dkt. No. 128 at 1. Their appearance is compelled. Finally, Plaintiff argues that certain of the documents and testimony that he requests are not privileged and are relevant to this action. *See* Dkt. No. 128 at 2–3. The Court will not decide any privilege or relevance issues before the hearing on May 19, 2023.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In his motion to compel discovery, Mr. Lee suggests that the Court has allowed Plaintiff “to obtain any and all ‘quitclaim deeds’ which I have done—apparently since the beginning of time—for *any* client or non-client ‘in New Jersey or New York.’” Dkt. No. 130 at 1 n.1. Mr. Lee improperly misconstrues the Court’s words. In its May 15, 2023 Order compelling discovery, the Court explicitly noted that the Order was “without prejudice to Defendants objecting to the production of any of the requested documents on privilege or relevance grounds.” Dkt. No. 129. Should Mr. Lee have a valid objection to producing all quitclaim deeds he has worked on “since the beginning of time,” including that “the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefits,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1), he is free to raise that objection provided that he produce physical copies of the documents to the Court’s chambers by 10:00 a.m. on May 19, 2023, for *in camera* review.

There are two respects in which the Court’s May 15, 2023 Order needs amplification. First, Defendants are directed to file on ECF by May 18, 2023 at 5:00 p.m., a letter detailing any objections they have to the production order, with a log identifying the document they object to producing and stating the basis for the objection. The Court will rule on the objections no later than before the hearing starts on May 19, 2023. Second, to the extent that Defendants object to the production of any documents, they shall deliver two copies of any objected to documents to

In turn, Defendants seek to compel the production of certain documents from Plaintiff. Dkt. No. 130. The documents fall into two categories: (1) documents that support the claim that Mr. Lee was representing Defendants at the time the default judgment was entered (Requests Nos. 1, 4, 5, and 6); and (2) documents regarding the date on which Plaintiff discovered Mr. Lee was representing Defendants (Requests Nos. 2 and 3). As to the first category (Requests Nos. 1, 4, 5, and 6), Plaintiff is ordered to produce to Defendant by 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 18, 2023, all such documents it intends to offer in evidence at the hearing. As to the second category, Plaintiff is ordered to produce documents responsive to Request No. 2 by 5:00 p.m. on May 18, 2023. The request for documents responsive to Request No. 3 is denied. Defendants are also directed to share any exhibits that they intend to offer in evidence at the hearing with Plaintiff by 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, May 18, 2023.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 16, 2023  
New York, New York



LEWIS J. LIMAN  
United States District Judge

---

the Court, such that—if the Court overrules the objection—the document at issue can be provided to Plaintiff.